

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending and under consideration.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Thorland et al. (US 6,457,071) (hereinafter "Thorland").

Thorland discloses a system and method for determining connection accuracy at an interface. The system and method of Thorland includes a host computer 100, a peripheral device 200, and a connection cable 201. Thorland, 5:12-5:15.

Further in Thorland, the peripheral device could transmit the identification information along one or more selected wires, and the host computer would perform detection so as to locate the expected signal among the wires coming into the host computer side of the connection which may be a motherboard. Thorland, 7:49-7:54.

According to the method of Thorland, in an uncommunicative condition, the host, after a certain period of time, will conclude that the connector is either entirely absent, or connected far from its proper position and can display a message to the user indicating this finding. The peripheral device, being unable to locate an identifying feature on any incoming line may also communicate the lack of connection directly to the user. Such communication can comprise the use of "blink codes" which cause an LED or other light on the peripheral to turn on and off a fixed number of times, or to turn on a dedicated hazard light specifically indicating a lack of connection to the host. Thorland, 9:18-9:29.

### Claims 1, 4 and 5

Claim 1 recites: "...a timer that counts a time required for receiving the command from the host." In contrast to claim 1, Thorland does not disclose a timer that counts a time required for receiving the command from the host. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. The Examiner has pointed to column 9, lines 18-20 of Thorland, which discusses that "the host, after a certain period of time, will conclude that the connector is either entirely absent..." to anticipate the timer recited in claim

1. However, these lines in Thorland do not discuss a timer. Further, it is respectfully submitted that a timer would not be inherent in Thorland either. To establish inherency, it must be clear that the missing component is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference. That standard is not met in Thorland where a timer is not necessary.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**Claims 6-10**

Claim 6 recites: "...if a command is not received from the host for a predetermined period of time after the flag is set, commanding a timer to increase a time counter..." Similar to the argument made regarding claim 1, in contrast to claim 6, Thorland does not discuss a timer. Further, Thorland does not discuss commanding a timer to increase a time counter.

Claims 7-10 depend on claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**Claims 11-14**

Claim 11 recites: "...a timer circuit configured to increment a time counter each time the controller checks for the command signal and does not detect a command signal." Similar to the argument made for claim 1, in contrast to amended claim 11, Thorland does not discuss a timer circuit.

Claims 12-14 depend on claim 11 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**Claim 15**

Claim 15 recites: "...incrementing a counter if no command signal was detected..." In contrast to claim 15, Thorland does not disclose a counter. Thorland suggests that the host, after a certain period of time, will conclude that the connector is not connected, but does not disclose a counter.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**CLAIM REJECTION – 35 USC 103**

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorland.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable over Thorland for the foregoing reasons. Further, claim 3 recites features that patentably distinguish over Thorland. For example, claim 3 recites that the indicator is a light emitting diode that turns on in response to the control signal output from the controller, when the host is connected to the AT Attachment Packet Interface (ATAPI) drive via the input/output cable, and turns off when the host is not connected to the AT Attachment Packet Interface (ATAPI) drive via the input/output cable.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 2, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501